#### RESUME OF SERVICE CAREER

of

# **DONAL LLOYD TURKAL, Major General**

DATE AND PLACE OF BIRTH: 14 August 1924, Detroit, Michigan

**TOTAL YEARS OF SERVICE**: Over 42 years

YEARS OF COMMISSIONED SERVICE: Over 33 Years

**DATE OF USAR RETIREMENT** 14 August 1984

### **MILITARY SCHOOLS ATTENDED**

The Transportation School, Basic and Advanced Course The Command and General Staff College (Nonresident) Industrial College of the Armed Forces (Nonresident) Army War College (Nonresident) Senior Officer Orientation Course George Washington University - JD Degree - Law

## CHRONOLOGICAL RECORD OF DUTY ASSIGNMENTS

FROM		<u>TO</u>		ASSIGNMENT		
Dec	50	Jun	52	PLT LDR, 334 <sup>th</sup> Trans Regulating Grp (Rwy)		
Jun	52	Jun	57	PLT LDR, 5000 <sup>th</sup> GHQ, TMRS		
Jun	57	Apr	63	HQ Comdt, 5000 <sup>th</sup> GHQ, TMRS		
May	63	May	64	Gen Supt, Car Dept, 5000 <sup>th</sup> GHQ, TMRS		
May	64	Nov	65	Shop Supt, 5000 <sup>th</sup> GHQ, TMRS		
Dec	65	Aug	69	Instr, 2079 <sup>th</sup> USAR School		
Sep	69	Sep	70	Instr, 5038 <sup>th</sup> USAR School		
Oct	70	Oct	71	Plans Off, 102 <sup>nd</sup> ARCOM		
Nov	71	Aug	73	G4, 102 <sup>nd</sup> ARCOM		
Sep	73	Jan	74	CO, 307 <sup>th</sup> Civil Affairs Grp		
Jan	74	Jun	76	CO, 3 <sup>rd</sup> Trans Bde (Rwy)		

Jul 76 Jun 80 C), 85<sup>th</sup> Tng Div (AR-OSUT)

DATES OF APPOINTMENT		
21	Dec	50
13	Mar	53
26	Oct	55
28	Apr	60
30	Jun	65
29	Jun	72
12	Feb	75
30	Jan	77
	21 13 26 28 30 29 12	21 Dec 13 Mar 26 Oct 28 Apr 30 Jun 29 Jun 12 Feb

### **US DECORATIONS AND BADGES**

Distinguished Service Medal Bronze Star Medal w/ V Device Meritorious Service Medal Army Commendation Medal Combat Infantryman Badge

**SOURCE OF COMMISSION** Direct Appointment

**INTERVIEW ABSTRACT** 

Interview with MG (Ret) Donal L. Turkal

**Major Terry Hunter** interviewed **MG TURKAL** on 14 April 1987, at Fort Eustis, Virginia. Most of his experience was with railroads and railroading.

**MG TURKAL** started his interview by tracing his career as an enlisted soldier in the Combat Infantry. He then received his commission and went into the Transportation Corps with the outbreak of the Korean conflict. He explained why he opted for the Transportation Corps instead of Quartermaster, Infantry, or the Engineers during the Korean War.

He described his training, duties, and the Transportation units he was assigned to. He went on to describe his career with the Transportation Corps Military Railway Service. He explained what these units consisted of and the changes that took place within the rail units. He talked about the annual training at Fort Eustis with the 3rd Transportation Corps Brigade.

He speculated as to why the deactivation of the military railroad took place and the loss of railroad expertise in the Army. He began his theory with the railroads in World War II and ended with today. He told what would be needed to get the military railroads into operation again in peacetime and in war. He believed that the reserves could do the job. He addressed the "Host Country" concept to railroading in the war scenario in Europe and Asia. He felt that the "Host Country" concept was the core of the decline of the military railroad. He concluded his interview by saying that Fort Eustis should become involved in rail reserve activity.

This is the Army Transportation Oral History interview conducted with **MG (Ret) Donal L. Turkal** on 14 April 1987 by **MAJ Terry W. Hunter** at Fort Eustis, Virginia.

**MAJ HUNTER**: I would like to ask you first to trace your career, I believe you began as an enlisted soldier, receiving the Combat Infantry Badge (CIB) and the Bronze Star with (V) device and then receiving your commission and going into the Transportation Corps in 1951 with the outbreak of the Korean conflict.

MG TURKAL: That's correct. I started my career in the Army in August of 1942 as an enlisted man, having enlisted in the Enlisted Reserve Corps at the University of Maryland at College Park, Maryland. I remained as an enlisted man until commissioned in early January 1951. I did not participate in the Korean War, but I was commissioned during the Korean War.

**MAJ HUNTER**: In the Enlisted Reserves, were you in Europe or.....

**MG TURKAL**: I was in Europe in 1944 and 1945 and was discharged from active duty in 1945, but remained in the reserves.

MAJ HUNTER: What units were you with over there?

**MG TURKAL**: I was with an Engineer and Quartermaster company and later as an infantryman in the 28th Infantry Division.

**MAJ HUNTER**: After your discharge you went to law school in Washington D.C. that correct?

MG TURKAL: Yes, I was discharged from the service in 1945. In 1946 I returned to undergraduate school at the University of Maryland and finished up what had been interrupted by the war. I entered law school at George Washington University in February 1948, and was graduated in February 1950 in two full years without taking any summers off. I became a member of the bar of the District of Columbia in 1950. In later years, I became a member of the bars of the states of Virginia, Missouri, Minnesota and Texas and the Supreme Court of the United States.

**MAJ HUNTER**: I understand that you turned down a direct commission as a first lieutenant in the Judge Advocate General (JAG) Corps and opted for a second lieutenant commission in the Transportation Corps (TC). Why the Transportation Corps? Why not the Quartermaster Corps, the Infantry or the Engineers?

MG TURKAL: At the time the commissions were offered to me I was an administrative law judge with the Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC), dealing in the regulation of civilian surface transportation. I was involved with the legal side of that regulation and I preferred to do something somewhat related to my civilian job, but yet I did not want to be an Army lawyer. So I took the second lieutenant commission in the Transportation Corps. A friend of mine, who was likewise commissioned at the same time, took a JAG first lieutenant commission. He retired as a lieutenant colonel. And, I was luckier and retired as a major general. So I guess my selection to be a Transportation Corps second lieutenant was the right move.

MAJ HUNTER: As a TC 2LT during the Korean conflict what were your duties?

MG TURKAL: I was not on active duty at any time subsequent to World War II (WWII) except for my calls to active duty for training for 2 weeks with my units and for various schools I attended, including the Army War College (AWC), Command and General Staff College (CGSC), Industrial College of the Armored Forces, the Transportation School's Advanced and Basic courses (TOAC and TOBC), and the career courses (DATMC) here. So my duties during the time of the Korean War were primarily as a civilian, and as a very junior reserve officer in several Transportation units.

MAJ HUNTER: Where were these units located?

MG TURKAL: The units were located in the Washington DC area where there was a Transportation Regulation Group, to which I was first assigned as a 2LT. I later transferred to the 5000<sup>th</sup> General Headquarters Military Railway Service (GHQ-MRS),

which at that time was commanded by a MG Arthur G. Stoddard, (President of the Union Pacific Railroad) and later commanded by a MG W. Thomas Rice, [also interviewed] who retired as a Chief Executive Officer and Chairman of the Board of the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad. I remained with that unit until it was deactivated in 1969, and then moved to 2079th United States Army Reserve (USAR) School in Richmond, Virginia, and later to the 5038th USAR School in St Louis where my civilian job was moved. I taught in the Command and General Staff Departments of both schools. Afterwards I transferred to the 102d Army Reserve Command (ARCOM) as Schools' Plans Officer and then later as G-4. Eventually I became the Commander of the 307th Civil Affairs Group, later Commander of the 3rd Transportation Brigade Railway and finally to Commander of the 85th Division, which was at the time of my assignment an Infantry Training Division, but later was converted to an Armor Training Division.

**MAJ HUNTER**: There is about a ten year yap between your railway service, in the 60's when you were with the 5000 GHQ-MRS and then in the interim you went to a USAR school and then the 102d ARCOM as the G-4, so I guess what you're telling me then, is that most of your TC career has always been with the Rail, is that correct?

**MG TURKAL**: Yes. Except to the extent that I was, became affiliated or acquired limited knowledge of motor transportation in connection with my civilian job in the regulation of surface transportation, or through the various schools which had motor transportation subjects. Of course, some of the schools were here at Fort Eustis or wherever else I've gone. But my primary duties have been rail. I was associated with civilian railroad transportation from December 1954 until I retired in September 1986.

**MAJ HUNTER**: You now live in Texas. Is that as a result of that retirement or, did you move there from St Louis?

MG TURKAL: I went from Washington where I was working for the Interstate Commerce Commission, to Norfolk, Virginia, to work for the Seaboard Air Line Railroad Company, and when the Seaboard transferred its headquarters to Richmond, VA, I moved along with it. In 1969 I was offered a job with the St Louis-San Francisco Railway Company (Frisco) in St Louis and stayed with the Frisco until it merged with the Burlington-Northern Railroad in September 2 1980. As a result, I was moved to St Paul, Minnesota in 1981 and later when the Burlington-Northern moved a considerable portion of it's corporate offices to Fort Worth, Texas in 1984, I was moved along. I retired from railroad service in September 1986. My home will continue to be in Fort Worth.

**MAJ HUNTER**: Just so it is clear with me, sir. I know the 3rd Transportation Brigade Railway was headquartered in St Louis, where is the 85th Division located?

MG TURKAL: Chicago. I commuted to Chicago three weekends out of four each month, for four years. Usually I would leave St Louis for Chicago on Friday afternoon and return late Sunday night. I attended my meetings there and visited my units in the Chicago area. The fourth weekend of the month I visited the units (one brigade and four

battalions) of the 85th Division that were located in the St Louis area and in southern Missouri and so consequently I did a considerable amount of travel while I commanded the 85th Division. We had units from as far north as Waukegan, Illinois and as far south as Farmington, Missouri.

MAJ HUNTER: You're retired from the military service, what year did you retire?

MG TURKAL: I retired from the United States Army August 21, 1984, after 42 years service.

**MAJ HUNTER**: That's incredible, sir. You witnessed the 5000 GHQ-MRS being deactivated; did you also witness the 3rd TC Brigade being deactivated?

**MG TURKAL**: No, I became Commander of the 85th Division and subsequent to my assumption of command of the 85th Division, the 3rd TC Brigade was deactivated. COL David Nagy commanded the 3rd TC Brigade at the time of its deactivation.

MAJ HUNTER: And what year was that, sir?

MG TURKAL: In 1977.

**MAJ HUNTER**: I am sure that was the last major TC-Rail headquarters in the Army Reserves.

**MG TURKAL**: It was the last major TC-Rail brigade, but that brigade has now been reactivated and its headquarters, I believe, is in Anniston, Alabama. Formerly the command position of the 3rd TC Brigade was a brigadier general, but that position has been downgraded to a colonel with the reactivation. I've always felt that the reason for the deactivation of the 3rd TC Brigade was a general officer position was needed somewhere else. That was a way to do it, by deactivating a unit, obtaining the general officer position and then later reactivating the unit with the command position as a colonel.

There are still some Railroad Reserve units in the Army system. There is a Railroad Car Equipment Repair Company in St Louis. There is also a Railway Car Equipment Repair and a Locomotive Repair Equipment Company in Milwaukee. I believe there may be a battalion or two in the Pittsburgh or Philadelphia area, or least several years ago such units existed. I have not been able to determine whether they are still active or not.

MAJ HUNTER: They just brought in two locomotives that were donated recently to the T-School and they're now under civilian contract. They're upscaling the AIT of that MOS for railroad and there are three units they designated, there's was one in Milwaukee, one somewhere in the Chicago area, I think, maybe it's the headquarters, the brigade headquarters in Chicago, I think and then there is also one in Jacksonville, Florida, and one somewhere in New England, I think Connecticut. Those were the three areas.

MG TURKAL: The one in Jacksonville, Florida, was a subordinate unit of the 3rd TC Brigade at one time. In the Reserve situation (when we had the 5000 GHQ), the 3rd Transportation Brigade Railway and the 1st Transportation Brigade Railway were its subordinate units. BG Thomas Fuller, who was assistant to the President of the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company, commanded the 1st. General Fuller was the 1st Transportation Brigade's only commander. When the 3rd was first activated, BG Clark Hungerford (President, Frisco) commanded it. Later the lst Transportation Brigade Railway was deactivated, but the 3rd Brigade continued in existence. After BG Hungerford, the 3rd was commanded by BG Wilburn Allen (Vice President, Frisco), BG L. V. Anderson (Vice President, Milwaukee Railroad), and me. Later, as I mentioned earlier, Colonel David Nagy commanded it.

**MAJ HUNTER**: When you were in that unit (the 3rd TC Brigade), I noticed that you often had your Annual Training (AT) here at Fort Eustis. What did your training involved? What did you all do for two weeks?

MG TURKAL: When we came to Fort Eustis (since we had satellite units at various locations, such as in St Paul, Minnesota, Washington DC and the main headquarters at St Louis) we were able to consolidate and train as a unit. When we came to Fort Eustis, we were able to put our people together and to a limited degree become a general headquarters. Actually the 3rd Transportation Brigade headquarters being a supervisory type unit, did not have any direct functions with respect to the repair of locomotives or cars at Fort Eustis, but we did bring our subordinate units with us. Our car repair companies, and particularly the locomotive repair companies would repair the locomotives at Fort Eustis that had become deadlined and with the skilled people that were in the unit, we were able to leave Fort Eustis after the two cycle 14 day training periods with the locomotives up and running. Often I was able to go to the presidents of various railroads (notably the Richmond-Fredricksburg and the Potomac Railroad in Richmond, VA,) and have them donate spare parts. Our people would use those spare parts to repair the locomotives at Fort Eustis. Otherwise, Fort Eustis would have had to contract these locomotives out to either the Chesapeake & Ohio or independent locomotive repair companies to repair the locomotives. We were able to do it at no cost. In several instances our personnel have repaired the signal system of the Fort Eustis Railroad. Fort Eustis had a terribly difficult time trying to keep the signal system in order, but we had signal experts in our units and they were able, with their equipment, to come in, find out what was wrong, (for example, where the voltage drops were occurring) and correct the problems.

MAJ HUNTER: So your last AT with the 3rd TC Brigade was in '76?

MG TURKAL: That's correct, in 1976.

**MAJ HUNTER**: Then of course, the unit was later deactivated, so its last AT was with you, was it not?

MG TURKAL: Yes, at Fort Eustis.

**MAJ HUNTER**: It is my understanding, the last active duty Rail unit was deactivated in the summer of 1972. It was the 714th Railway Operating Battalion, so from 1972 to 1976 your unit was the most senior rail unit that continued to serve in its rail capacity here. After the 3rd TC Brigade's deactivation, I assume the next senior unit was the 67th TC Battalion from Jacksonville, Florida. In its 1979 AT, they were used in TRANSLOTS, which is a Terminal Operations Mission, not Rail, so I .....

MG TURKAL: The 67th is not a Battalion, it is a Group. It has no operating personnel in it. In case of a war, we'd need a top level, railroad unit, at least a military railway service. During WWII, it was the 5000 Transportation Military Railway Service that was the top railroad unit. Incidentally, the commander of the 5000th during World War II was MG Carl Gray, who later became Veterans Administrator. Under that type organization a brigade would exist similar to the 1st or the 3rd that I previously mentioned. Under the Brigade you would have Groups. Under the Groups then you would have your various operating, shop, and maintenance of way battalions.

The Army's theory that I've been able to discern with respect to the deactivation of the Railroad expertise in the Army was based on two conceptions both of which I believe are incorrect. One is "the host country" concept, which might be loosely involved with the status of forces agreements (SOFA) that we had with particular countries. The theory is that a host country could operate it's own railroads. An example being that, England, France or Germany supposedly wouldn't need any expertise in the United States Army to operate those kind of facilities. The fallaciousness of that argument made clear by history. In World War I and World War II France, Belgium, Germany, etc, were not able to operate their own railroads in many cases. In the limited instances where those countries attempted to operate with their own civilians, they didn't have the ability to run the number of miles and hours per day that we could require our Army railwaymen to do. A second problem was the inability to cross international borders. If a French railroad operates to the northern part of France, it will run into Belgium, Luxembourg, or Germany, and you can't get the Frenchmen to cross those borders. So consequently, I believe the host country concept was ill conceived. I have advised people at very high levels in the Pentagon that you just simply cannot depend on nationals of one particular country to operate railroads in an environment that would require transportation equipment to operate from the coast where ships would land all the way to inland points across international borders.

Secondly, the concept of no railroad unit in the military was also based on a so-called ability of the American Railroads to supply a cadre of trained personnel if we had a large scaled war. When World War II first started most of the railroads were steam powered, diesel had not come into vogue to a large degree. Most railroads had an overabundance of people at that time, and almost every railroad in this country supplied at least a railroad operating battalion. Several railroads, notably the Great Northern and the Pennsylvania, supplied grand divisions as well as railroad operating battalions. From today, what is known as the Burlington Northern Railroad supplied three railroad operating battalions, which came from the Chicago Burlington and Quincy, the Great Northern and from the Northern Pacific. With the advent of diesel locomotives,

computers and other modern devices much efficiency came about. As a result the railroad employment of this country today is about 20 percent of what it was when World War II started. There is no possibility that any railroad in this country could supply any significant number of people that could walk away from a civilian job today and run the Army railroads tomorrow. Consequently, both the "host country" concepts, and the railroad-supplied cadre concept, I believe, are ill conceived. Moreover, I don't believe our Army planners have looked into the possibility of asking the railroads whether they could supply battalions of railroad personnel. The railroads do not have the personnel today that would enable them to supply any meaningful number of trained personnel. I could name several former railroad officials who during World War II were commanders of railroad operating battalions or even companies, but they are long gone.

**MAJ HUNTER**: I think the logic behind that is a result from the closing days of World War II. You had a Phase I operation which was all military, a Phase II where you had a balance, maybe 50/50, where you had a conductor who was military and another person that was a local national. Finally it went to Phase III, where you turned the whole railroad over from military to civilian operation. It seemed to work from 1945 thru 1948 and maybe that did a mindset with the powers that be.

MG TURKAL: Yes that's true. That is exactly what set the minds but even if they had looked behind those operations, the foreign nationals that were operating those trains in a Phase III operation would not cross international borders. The labor strife in this country with respect to the railroads is serious, but in Europe it is even worse, because over there they have much more severe labor restrictions primarily because the railroads are government owned. Remembering that there are only two major railroad systems in the world that are not government owned, the United States Railroads (now that Conrail is now out from government ownership) and the Canadian Pacific Railroad in Canada. Almost every other railroad in the world is government owned. The U.S. Railroads average about a half employee per track mile. The Japanese on the other hand has about seven employees per track mile. That comparison gives you a remarkable difference between the efficiencies of the two systems and obviously the railroads in the U.S. couldn't operate as private enterprises if we had as many as seven employees per track mile, where as Japan can do it because its railroads receive substantial subsidies' from the Japanese government.

**MAJ HUNTER**: Maybe they are thinking about this host nation support, like the British did with the Falklands, how they took over the Queen Elizabeth II and they contracted/confiscated these assets. Do you think that the government could come in and confiscate the rail assets and put their own military personnel on the rai1road?

**MG TURKAL**: No question about it, if the balloon went up in France, or the Russians came West, the government of France could take over the operations of their railroads and could put military personnel on them. France has its own government personnel on their trains today, but they cannot cross international borders. If the United States were requested to supply railroad personnel, we could not supply the personnel who would run those railroads. It is my view that you don't need a substantial amount of rail assets

in the active military to support a war, anymore than you need a substantial number of assets in the military from the medical standpoint to support a war. However, we should have adequate reserve facilities in the various services for rail services to support a war. In the first place when you have an activated reserve railroad unit as we once did, we had people who were actively engaged in the performance of railroad functions five days a week on their civilian railroads. For example, we had people who were chief engineers, (the chief engineer of the Santa Fe Railroad was in the 5000 GHQ), chief mechanical officer (the head of the mechanical department of the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad was in the 5000 GHQ), and others. Those persons would be able to go home at night, take off their civilian clothes, put on their Army uniforms and do precisely the same thing in military they would do in the civilian jobs the same as an aviator or a medical man would. All we would have to do is teach them how to salute and how to wear a uniform and subject them to certain amounts of discipline that the military service requires. It would be, simple to transform from a civilian occupation to a military position. You can't do that with an infantryman or with an artilleryman because there are not any comparable civilian positions.

I feel a very active reserve would satisfy the full military needs in case of a war. Quite obviously, we do not know what kind of a war we are going to fight; we would not need military railroads in something like Vietnam. There were some railroads operating in Korea. If we were to fight a war in Europe, as we are certainly give some thought to, we would want some way to get the material from the ports to inland points of need. Many years ago, GEN James A. VanFleet wrote quite an article about the vulnerability of military railroads versus the vulnerability of highways. He concluded in his quite extensive article, that railroad facilities are far less vulnerable than highways. If a highway bridge is knocked out, how long does it take to put it back in shape? A railroad bridge could be replaced substantially sooner. We had experiences in Germany where our bombers knocked out railroad bridges at night and the next day they were back in operation. Rail facilities are much easier to repair and it's much easier to get things moving again. Of course, if you are going to transport heavy equipment like the Abrams Tank, the Bradley Fighting Vehicle, and some real heavy equipment, you can't take those over the highways and particularly the bridges without substantial damage occurring. Railroad facilities would need to be used. It seems to me, there is a definite need, and a requirement for railroad services in the reserve. The problem with the matter is that these units are now for the most part deactivated. The people have scattered to the four winds.

To reactivate a reserve railroad unit now and to bring in experts to head up the various departments of this military railroad unit would be extremely difficult, but it is not be any more difficult today than it would be two, four or ten years from now, if you're going to do it, you might as well start with it, and you ought to put these units in major railroad centers, Chicago, St Louis, Philadelphia, Atlanta, and perhaps Pittsburgh; i.e., places where you could have a source of civilian people that may be willing to serve in the military reserve. As I mentioned, the two locomotive repair companies that came to summer training at Fort Eustis, their personnel, (predominately from the Milwaukee Railroad) would take off their civilian clothes, put on their Army clothes, fly down here to

Fort Eustis and each work for two weeks, (four weeks total) repairing the locomotives. The personnel enjoyed the duty and Fort Eustis was pleased. The units were pleased to put their expertise where it would do the most good. That was simple for them. The repairs on some of these locomotives with respect to Fort Eustis was duck soup compared to repairing some of the locomotives they had in their own home shops, simply because the Fort Eustis locomotives didn't perform at high miles per hour, or with high tonnages behind the locomotives, as do the locomotives on civilian railroads, it was a lot easier and the repairs were relatively simple. As I say, the civilian railroads supplied a great many of the spare parts for which the Army stood no expense.

**MAJ HUNTER**: If we did put the reserve units in, let's say Pittsburgh or Chicago, these areas, and I am sure there are a lot of active reservists in these areas, but I am not so sure these reservists are railway people. To get those civilian railway people in the reserves, do we need an active recruiting campaign?

MG TURKAL: Of course I think it would be a problem, but I think the way to approach it, is I would first get introduced to some railroads officials at the Association of American Railroads in Washington, and then get the people in the various railroads interested. For instance, in Pittsburgh you have three or four major railroads. Chicago has many more. Basically in Pittsburgh, you have the CSX System, Conrail, the Pittsburgh and Lake Erie and pieces of the Norfolk Southern. So basically if you get the presidents of those various railroads interested, in supporting a military unit of sorts with people in their organizations that would work either as reserve officers or reserve enlisted personnel, they could give support by perhaps providing:

- (1) assembly rooms,
- (2) space where the personnel could keep their lockers for their clothing, and
- (3) let them go out into the shops or out on the line and work, not substitute work, because labor problems would then occur, but joint work with the various people in those shops.

In many instances, they would not even have to go work within the shop or out on line because the reservists themselves would be civilian railroaders. In Milwaukee, almost everyone, (even one of the vice presidents) in the military units, were working for the Milwaukee Railroad at the time it existed. Of course, those people are experts. It's similar to taking a surgeon from a local community hospital and putting him in a local reserve military hospital. They change uniforms but the expertise is already there. Inother words, my approach would be to get somebody who is interested from the civilian standpoint, ask him to give you some help on a consulting basis, even at no pay. Then work with the Association of American Railroads and the various railroads in the larger cities as a start. I don't think you can go out in a city and start recruiting (without the support of the local railroads), and do a whole lot. A whole lot, however, could be done with the support of the civilian railroads, and I think they would be glad to help.

To give you an example, the chief car repair officer of the Frisco came up to Fort Leonard Wood and helped us train a detachment of the 3rd Transportation Brigade that was performing the switching railroad cars in and out of the various facilities at Fort Leonard Wood. The civilian car repair railroad personnel must be certified or pass certain tests administered by the Federal Railroad Administration. That Frisco volunteer was able to help these people to become capable enough to pass the test. For a long period of time the 3rd Transportation Brigade provided this switching crew that would report at Fort Leonard Wood and operate on weekends the locomotives that belonged to the post. Those personnel operated the locomotives to Fort Leonard Wood junction and picked up all cars that had been placed there by the connecting railroad. They would pull all cars into Fort Leonard Wood, place them at the various warehouses, remove the empty cars and place them back on the interchange track with the connecting railroad. On Monday morning when the civilians reported to work, the cars were at locations for unloading. Thus the cars did not have to be switched by the local civilian crews who would normally perform those functions. Many benefits inured to Fort Leonard Wood cars were released quicker so that demurrage charges did not accrue. Greater efficiency resulted all around. The unit was getting hands-on military training by operating these locomotives. In this case the reservists were not civilian railroad employees, but were employees from various companies in and around the St Louis area. A female reservist at one time commanded the unit performing the weekend switching operation. Usually by Sunday evening the unit was finished with the switching. Of course, they could not do it as fast as the civilian people but they had the whole weekend to perform the tasks. They had to learn railroad safety requirements with which they were not acquainted with, but they did it.

The gentleman I mentioned came up from the Frisco shops in Springfield shops in Missouri and taught subjects concerning car repair. He did this on his own time, and it occurred simply because I was able to get in contact with the president of the Frisco and said to him, "Mr. Grayson, I would appreciate it if we could work together on this project." He said, "Go with it Don, you've got my permission. You tell them I said to do it." Then I went down and said, "Let's do it." and they were very happy to cooperate with us. If the support of the top is obtained, you'll get the support of the middle people and the bottom people, but you have to get in contact with the senior positioned railroad people. They don't want, without some sense of national emergency, or some patriotism, or something, to have Army reservists wandering around the railroad without their permission.

**MAJ HUNTER**: Sir, back in the fifties, sixties and early seventies, we had the 714th Rail unit here. The Chessie System would bring the rail cars down to the front gate; the 714th would bring the cars on post and deliver the rail cars to the various warehouses. I was even told they would take troops out to the rifle ranges. Did you have any experience with that when you were with the 5000th or the ATs in the 70s?

MG TURKAL: Back in those days when that unit was operating and taking people out to the rifle range in dilapidated passenger cars they had on post, I was only a lieutenant or a captain at most, so I didn't get too terribly involved in those operations except to be a passenger of those services, although I did ride in the locomotives as much as I could. The 5000th did not have any general supervision over that sort of thing, but the example that the 714th did here at Fort Eustis is precisely the kind of thing the detachment did on the weekends at Fort Leonard Wood. I didn't mention it but we received several awards from the post commander at Fort Leonard Wood for the service we performed for that installation at no cost.

**MAJ HUNTER**: Do you feel the downfall, if you want to call it a downfall, of the railroads in the military was the other side of the rise of aviation assets? It seems like they work hand in hand, as one went up, one went down.

MG TURKAL: I don't think that necessarily should follow. A matter of fact because the aviation assets got the money, it obviously had to come from some source. The rail source was one place from which they could divert money. However, the aviation assets cannot perform the heavy lift function of rail units. The air units got the money and consequently as aviation came up, rail went down. Not from the standpoint that they could perform the same functions better, but simply that the money was not available to do everything, so aviation got more emphasis than rail. As I mentioned, we do not need rail assets on peacetime active duty. However, you do need a large amount in aviation, especially with helicopters, because the helicopters' role in the Army is not the same as in the civilian world. So if you are going to teach people to fly helicopters and things of this nature from a military standpoint, you need to train them on active duty, but you don't need that for railroad operating people. The reserves would do just nicely thank you. You can see, that's a remarkably different thing. Most reserves would receive only about 60 days pay a year. They get paid for 48 drills and 14 days summer camp. Dividing 360 by 60 produces one sixth of the full time requirement. Moreover, civilian railroad reservists are trained on the up-to-date equipment that their railroads have in their own shops. The military cannot afford to purchase such equipment. Consequently, a better-trained person on equipment that is more up-to-date is the result. If we went overseas and we took our own locomotives with us, as we did in World War II, things would be relatively easy. If we go back to steam as we did in the early days of World War II because, oil was not readily Available in Europe, we would need to use the coal reserves from the Ruhr, or from other points in Europe. Railroading is a very peculiar kind of thing; you can teach a person to drive an automobile in a day or so. The art of railroading is much more profound and inherently more dangerous than it appears, and consequently is more difficult to teach.

**MAJ HUNTER**: I was told that the leaders in the Pentagon think that when you have to move a lot of bulk cargo, at a small expense, the only way to do it is by rail. But if you need something quick then you have to go by air. So if you have to get your assets from Point A to Point B, you can get the things you need there right away by air, and the things you don't need right away by train. So I think this is where the "host nation" concept came into being.

**MG TURKAL**: That's probably where the "host country" concept got its start. However, civilians are not going to be there in time of war to operate those railroads from the

place where they ships come to port. No question, if you are looking for platform-toplatform service, the trucks can perform such service for light weighted shipments, and they can perform it very fast. They cannot, however, move heavy tonnages, and it is virtually impossible to operate trucks on roads where tanks and other heavy equipment are being moved. Railroads could carry it and get it to the far inland points from which movement by truck could be accomplished. For example move it by rai1 to a depot and then move it in by truck to the desired destination. Or move it off the ship and over the shore into a depot, then by rail another 200 miles or so and then by truck. By simply putting it on a truck and taking it all the way from the port to the inland point is extremely time consuming and exceedingly expensive because a railroad can operate far cheaper than trucks, and the railroads will not damage the highway. In the civilian sector, a railroad-operating employee receives a full day's pay for each hundred miles. On many of the major lines, a hundred miles can be accomplished in two hours. Consequently if that employee works a full eight hours (he is permitted to work up to twelve), he could earn four days pay during a single hour period on duty. Now obviously, if military personnel were operating the railroads, there would be no limitation of a hundred miles for a day's pay. Military personnel could work much more and have a much more efficient operation than the civilian railroads. It would take a little while to get such an operation organized and running smoothly, but it would not be any more difficult than getting a highway transportation operation to run smoothly. It could be done.

**MAJ HUNTER**: Sir, we talked about the war scenario in Europe and also Asia, what are your feelings about the use of railroads in the Middle East?

**MG TURKAL**: Well, the General Rice (to whom I earlier reference who commanded 5000 GHQ at one time) was a major during the early portion of World War II. He had a considerable amount of rail experience to do that. Incidentally, GEN Rice now lives in Richmond, Virginia.

**MAJ HUNTER**: He has been interviewed. It is extremely interesting, all about the Iranian episode.

MG TURKAL: He is an outstanding railroad executive. He has operated small railroads such as the Richmond, Fredricksburg and Potomac (RF&P) which is 110 miles long and connects in the north near Washington, DC, with four major railroads and the south at Richmond, VA, with three major railroads. Later, GEN Rice became president of a moderate size railroad, the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad and then later the chief executive of an enormous size railroad, the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad. So, GEN Rice is a very able, capable person who could give you sound background in the Middle East running the railroads. I couldn't do that, because I have had no experience. Then there is another Richmonder (BG David C. Hastings), who was active in civilian railroads, and in military railroads in the reserve activity. He now lives in Jacksonville, Florida. At one time he was an operating officer active on the RF&P and active as the vice president of operations of the Atlantic Coast Line and later the Seaboard Coast Line. Both Generals Rice and Hastings are predecessors of mine. I served under General Rice, as a company grade officer, and under General Hastings as a major and

a lieutenant colonel. So it was subsequent to those assignments that I had my senior military assignments. Both General Rice and General Hastings are outstanding railroaders, and they could give you a lot of insight on railroad operations.

**MAJ HUNTER**: In General Rice's interview a person felt like he was actually there. He knew all the places, all the extremities of the heat in the desert versus the coldness in the mountains. It was a superb interview. Sir, we mentioned host nation support, and we have talked about the rise of the aviation assets at the detriment possibly of the railroad assets, do you have anything else to add about the decline of the railroads with the military?

MG TURKAL: No, I think basically, at the foundation of the decline of the railroad in the military, are the "host country" concept and the thought that the civilian railroads could provide a cadre. I think that is the core of the whole decline. When I was the commander of the 3rd TC Brigade, I went to Washington and talked to the J-3 (who was an Air Force general officer) and I convinced him to step in defer the deactivation of the 3rd brigade for a couple of years. I was able to get through to him whereas; I could not get through to the Army people. I went outside the Army chain of command to talk to that Air Force general officer, who was on the Joint Staff, and he easily was able to perceive my views that there was a considerable amount of need for a railroad capability in the reserve to be called to active duty in the event we had a conflict. When I left the 3rd Transportation Brigade, I had no right to be sticking my nose into the operation of the brigade; I had enough to do commanding the 85th Division. The new commander of the 3rd Brigade did not have the inclination to try to stop the deactivation that I did. Although I gave him telephone numbers and names, he just simply didn't have the desire to work in that area. I guess, I was sort of a bold person. I would just bolt in. The new commander was much more sedate, calm, and quiet. I was sort of a foot stomper. Consequently, I was able to get things done that simply could be done in a casual manner.

**MAJ HUNTER**: Sir, you are here today from Texas for the DATMAC Conference. Are you the keynote speaker to the students? If so, what is going to be the subject matter of your talk today?

MG TURKAL: I am not the keynote speaker. I have been teaching this class since 1958. This is my 87th time that I have taught this class. Sometimes, it has been as many as three times a year. I have been teaching, Economics of Regulation, Transportation Economics, and Common Carrier Regulation. Basically my approach is to explain to the students how we come about. Regulation, the fact that the Interstate Commerce Act was passed in 1887 because of the bad railroaders that had discriminated against certain industries and that such acts were responsible for the various regulations of the railroads, the trucks, the water carriers, and the freight fowarders. I explain how the regulation reached its zenith in the early 1970s and the gradual demise of that regulation to a point that now a considerable amount of the transportation regulation of the country has been phased out. I discuss the new acts as they are passed, for instance the Staggers Act, the Motor Carrier Act of 1980, and the

Bus Act of 1985. I am able to bring the students from an environment where we had no regulation, through where we had substantial regulation to our present posture where we have little. I have been teaching this class since I was a captain. I enjoy teaching the class. I started teaching the class when I lived in Richmond, continued to teach it when I lived in St Louis, and St Paul ' and now Fort Worth. Even though I am retired, the Transportation School continues to invite me.

MAJ HUNTER: So you retired from the military, as well from the civilian life.

**MG TURKAL**: I retired from the Army Reserve in August 1984 and I retired from my civilian in September 1986.

**MAJ HUNTER**: So what do you do in your free time now?

MG TURKAL: Well, some of it might seem a little bit trite. My hobby is playing duplicate bridge in bridge tournaments at various places in the country. I am also very deeply involved with a voluntary program of helping the poor and the non-English speaking people with their income taxes. Since January I have prepared 185 income tax returns for people who do not understand our federal tax system. The IRS trains us and then places us at various locations to which the people needing help come. I have worked at a Wal-Mart store, a K-Mart store, a Post office, and a library. I also have gone to various homes when I realize the tax work is going to take too long to accomplish at a particular location on a particular day.

I have participated in ceremonies at various schools, (the University of Texas, and Texas Christian University, and perhaps later this year at Southern Methodist University) where medals are awarded and commissions conferred. I am still active in the Interstate Commerce Commission's Bar; I am vice president for Texas and on the Executive Committee. I have a small private law practice; I have represented some shippers with respect to abandoments of railroad and of their facilities. I have advised some people on what should be done concerning the purchase of short line railroads. The social security laws and the railroad retirement laws under which I am receiving benefits limit my earnings to \$6000 a year. So I am limited as to the amount I can earn. I am having a great deal of fun. My wife wants me out of the house. She is a very avid golfer and I am an avid bridge player, and golf is played in the day and bridge is played at night. We don't see much of each other. I do some traveling. I am extremely interested in doing something with the reserves. Fort Eustis should be the kingpin behind all of this rail reserve activity and start something. If it wanted some help in the civilian railroad area, I would be able to get them into the right avenues. I don't want to wait ten years because by that time those avenues will be filled with people I don't know. I also do a little lobbying work before Congress, so I am keeping busy. If I am away three weeks as I was recently, I came back to a lot mail to answer, including the material concerning this interview.

**MAJ HUNTER**: Are you involved at all with the National Defense Transportation Association (NDTA)?

MG TURKAL: I am not. I was at one time a member of NDTA, but I am no longer a member. Although last year I participated as a group leader concerning the annual convention of the Military Traffic Management Command (MTMC) Eastern Region in Florida. I chaired a group that had a presentation to make for a full day session, in which BG Paul C. Hurley (who I noticed is in this year's program, as the DATMAC graduation guest speaker) was an active participant. MG Harold I. Small (also interviewed] was also there. I am active in the Association of U.S. Army (AUSA), in the Reserve Officer Association (ROA) and in The Retired Officers Association (TROA). I occasionally make talks on the tax laws and the laws and regulations concerning wills and estates in Texas. In fact I recently spoke on the new tax laws of 1987.

**MAJ HUNTER**: Sir, I think we are winding down here, is there anything else you would like to add about the railroads?

MG TURKAL: I can't think of anything. If any questions occur to you ask them and I'll answer. I think that if you're looking for four or five officers that would be examples of what you can do in the reserve, while holding down full time active civilian jobs, you should talk to General Rice, General Hastings, General Allen and myself. We are probably the four most active persons who have been Transportation Officers and who held down full-time civilian jobs as well as participated actively in the military. The last seven years in my military, I averaged 106 days active duty each year. Many of the days were from 0500 until 2200 to 2400. Many other days were more than eight hours long. Many of us who were active in the reserve contributed all of our vacation time to that particular activity. If you wanted reserve officers, i.e., persons who were gung ho and wanted to remain in the USAR, the classic example of in the Transportation Corps, was those four individuals I earlier named.

**MAJ HUNTER**: Now, is General Hastings still with the railroad industry or is he retired from it?

**MG TURKAL**: As I earlier related, he is retired, both military and civilian wise. He was vice president of operations of the Seaboard Coast Line. As I said, although he now lives in Jacksonville, Florida, he formerly lived in Richmond, Virginia. General Rice has been a Richmonder for many years. General Hastings is a graduate of VMI (1937), General Rice is a graduate of VPI (1934); both Virginia colleges.

MAJ HUNTER: Sir, I want to thank you for your time, I know you are very busy.

**MG TURKAL**: Besides having this class to teach and having a luncheon to go, feel free to give me a call this afternoon if I can be of any further assistance to you.